

## TRANSMITTAL FORM

(To be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

| Application Number   | 09/778,669           |  |
|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Filing Date          | February 7, 2001     |  |
| First Named Inventor | Francesco Pappalardo |  |
| Art Unit             | 2121                 |  |
| Examiner Name        | Joseph P. Hirl       |  |
| Attorney Docket No.  | 851763.401           |  |

| ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Fee Transmitta Fee Attach Amendment/R After Final Affidavits/d Extension of T Express Aband Request Information Dis Statement; For Cited Reference Certified Copy Document(s) Response to M under 37 C.F.F. Response to M Parts/Incomple  | al Form ned esponse  declaration(s) ime Request donment sclosure m PTO-1449 ces of Priority  dissing Parts R. 1.52 or 1.53  dissing | Drawing(s) Request for Corrected Filing Receipt Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation, Change of Correspondence Address Declaration Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) Landscape Table on C | After Allowance Communication to TC Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Return Receipt Postcard Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Form PTOL-85 +1; Comments of Reasons for Allowance; Fee Address Indication Form |  |
| Remarks   |   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |   |  |
| SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT  |   |   |   |  |
| Firm Name   | Seed Intelled   | tual Property Law Group PLLC  | Customer Number 00500   |  |
| Signature   |   |   |   |  |
| Printed Name  | Robert lannu  | cci   |   |  |
| Date  | February 17,  | 2005 Reg  | g. No. 33,514   |  |
| CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING   |   |   |   |  |
| I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. |   |   |   |  |
| Signature   |   |   |   |  |
| Typed or printed n  | ame   |   | Date:   |  |
| This collection of information is   | required by 37 CFR 1  | 5. The information is required to obtain or retain a bu   | enefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to  |  |

Inis collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants

Francesco Pappalardo et al.

Application No.

09/778,669

Filed

February 2, 2001

For

METHOD FOR PROCESSING FUZZY INFERENCES AND

CORRESPONDING PROCESSING STRUCTURE

Examiner

Joseph P. Hirl

Art Unit

2121

Date of Notice

of Allowance

November 18, 2004

Docket No.

851763.401

Date

February 17, 2004

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

## **COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

## Commissioner for Patents:

In the Examiner's comments with the Notice of Allowance mailed November 18, 2004, the Examiner stated that the reason for allowance was the failure of the prior art to teach or suggest features that are not recited in all of the claims. For example, the Examiner indicates that the prior art does not disclose checking in a computer structure for a value that is redundant to a new value and, if such checking does not return an affirmative result, then such new value is appropriately stored. However, none of the independent claims recites such a storing step, although a similar storing step is recited in dependent claim 5 and fuzzy inference encoding

Application No. 09/778,669 Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

means for performing a storing function is recited in claim 23. The applicants assume that the Examiner was simply summarizing one reason for allowing one or more claims and did not intend for that reason to apply to all of the claims. Obviously, the allowed claims were allowed because the prior art fails to teach or suggest the elements actually recited in those claims.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

Robert İannucci

Registration No. 33,514

RXI:lmt

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300 Seattle, Washington 98104-7092

Phone: (206) 622-4900 Fax: (206) 682-6031

553604\_1.DOC